

## NOTE XII.

## CONCHOLOGICAL CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS

BY

**M. M. SCHEPMAN.**

---

*Melania Junghuhni* Schepman.

In Vol. XVIII, pag. 135, of this periodical I have described a new *Melania* with the specific name *Junghuhni*. Now some time ago Prof. K. Martin directed my attention to the fact, that this name was preoccupied for a fossil species, described in 1879/80 in his work: *Die Tertiärschichten auf Java; Palaeontologischer Theil*, pag. 89, pl. XIV, fig. 20. So his name has the priority, and my species must receive another name, for which I propose *Melania Martini*, after the person who has detected the error. I may make the apology, that, as it is already not an easy matter to avoid such errors with the names of recent species, it becomes very difficult, to know also the names of the numerous fossils.

*Pupina sucinacia* Boettger.

In studying some specimens of *Pupina* from Java, I got for comparison the types of *Pupina Junghuhni* (Herklots ms.) from the Leyden Museum, described by Prof. von Martens, in: *Die Preussische Expedition nach Ost-Asien; Zool. Theil*, 1867, pag. 156, and was struck with the extreme resemblance of this species to *P. sucinacia* Boettger, described

Notes from the Leyden Museum, Vol. XX.

in: Bericht über die Senckenbergische naturf. Gesellschaft in Frankfurt a/M., 1890, pag. 157, especially with the variety bearing the manuscript name *porcellanea*; indeed I could not detect a single character that might have specific value. The Museum specimens are partly deprived of the enamel, but this is only individual, probably they were not collected alive, as the operculum is wanting. Prof. Boettger, having seen a typical specimen, fully agrees with my opinion and so *P. sucinacia* falls in synonymy, since the name *Junghuhnii* has the priority for twenty three years. I think this error may be accounted for, by the different method of measuring; von Martens says:

«Long. 11, diam. maj. 9, min.  $5\frac{2}{3}$ ; apert. alt. 6, lat. 5 Mill.» and Boettger: «Alt. 9— $9\frac{1}{2}$ , diam. max.  $6\frac{1}{2}$ —7, apert. intus  $3\frac{3}{4}$  mm. alta, 3 lata.»

Now the largest specimen in the Leyden Museum has from the apex to the base of the peristome only  $10\frac{1}{3}$  mill. long.; so «Long. 11» by von Martens is probably a typographical error for 10, the other specimen measures scarcely 10 mill.; these measurements are taken diagonally; if taken perpendicularly they are still smaller. The diam. maj. of 9 mill., is even scarcely reached if one takes the utmost breadth in an oblique direction; if measured horizontally without the peristome it is a trifle more than 7 mill. Von Martens has measured the aperture with the peristome in its largest extension, Boettger without the peristome. It is a new proof how desirable it is to have a uniform method for measuring shells.

### *Cyclotus dimidiatus* Kobelt.

A few months ago I had to study some shells from Celebes, belonging to the Leyden Museum, amongst which I found a *Cyclotus* which I suggested to be *C. dimidiatus* Kobelt, described in: Abhandlungen und Berichte des Königl. Zool. und Anthropol. Ethnogr. Museums zu Dresden, 1896/97, N° 5, under the title »Schnecken von N. O.

Notes from the Leyden Museum, Vol. XX.

Celebes u. Banggai." The shell agreed in every respect, but as I found that it had the rapidly increasing upper whorls radiately and concentrically striated, the last whorl being comparatively smooth, and that the peristome was orange yellow, which important characters wanted in the description, I asked Dr. Kobelt to inform me if his shell possesses the same characters. Dr. Kobelt wrote that the specimen was returned to Dr. A. B. Meyer, Director of the Dresden Museum, who on his turn told me, it was sent for comparison to the brethren P. and F. Sarasin in Basle, who wrote in reply on my request, that the specimens have: »einen hell orange rothen Mundsaum und dass sie die erwähnte Gittersculptur auf den oberen Windungen aufs deutlichste zeigen." Thus I found my determination to be right.

I thought it might be useful to publish these facts, as especially the sculpture of the upper whorls may greatly tend to recognize the species, for I cannot find a similar structure in any of the other species of *Cyclotus* from Celebes.

Rhoon near Rotterdam, December 1897.